

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 10 continue to be in the case.

New claims 11 to 13 are introduced.

New claim 11 is based on the language of US 2006/0219654 A1, page 2, paragraph 33, lines 4 to 7 and is based on the language of US 2006/0219654 A1, page 3, paragraph 68, lines 2 to 6.

New claim 12 is based on the language of claims 1 and 10 of this application.

New claim 13 is based on the language of US 2006/0219654 A1, page 2, paragraph 33, lines 4 to 7 and is based on the language of US 2006/0219654 A1, page 3, paragraph 68, lines 2 to 6 and Fig. 10 of this application.

The Office Action refers to Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim 1, drawn to product.

Group II, claim(s) 2-9, drawn to method of etching.

New claim 11 depends on claim 1 and belongs to Group I.

New claim 12 is based on claim 1 and belongs to Group I.

New claim 13 depends on claim 12 and belongs to Group I.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Applicants select the invention of group I.

The selected invention encompasses claims 1 and 10 to 13.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.


The selection of group I is being made with traverse.

Applicants' position is that the alleged two inventions are so closely related that they should be prosecuted together.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Karola Richter et al.

By: 
Horst Kasper, their attorney
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059
Tel.: (908)526-1717; Reg. No. 28559
Attorney's Docket No.: HMP201

*%AMEND(rep/am